

---

**DCSS P3 PROGRAM  
PERFORMANCE MEASURES WORKGROUP  
JULY 19, 2000 MEETING  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**A. GENERAL**

On Wednesday, July 19, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Performance Measures Workgroup held its first official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Linda Anisman (Small County Rep – Inyo County)
- ☒ Mica Bennett (FTB Rep)
- ☒ John Braun (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Carmen Cody (DCSS Co-Leader)
- ☒ Michael Coleman (DCSS Rep)
- ☒ Sharon Covarrubias (FTB Rep)
- ☐ Marsha Devine (Judicial Council Rep)
- ☐ Lenny Goldberg (Advocates Rep)
- ☒ Leora Gershenson for Lenny Goldberg
- ☒ Susan Green (County Co-Leader – San Diego County)
- ☒ Deborah Harper (SEIU Rep)
- ☒ Rita Hayes-Thompson (Medium County Rep – Ventura County)
- ☒ Alan Hiromura (CSAC Rep)
- ☒ Gail Juiliano (Large County Rep – Los Angeles County)
- ☒ Ken Masuda (CSAC Rep)
- ☐ Sharyn Matsumoto (CSSAS Rep)
- ☐ Liz Mechem (CSSAS Rep)
- ☒ Nancy Melton (County Analyst – Riverside County)
- ☐ Barb Saunders (OCSE Rep)
- ☐ Melanie Snider (Advocates Rep)
- ☒ Robert McCloud for Melanie Snyder
- ☒ Mark Whitmore (County Co-Leader – San Diego County)
- ☒ Lillie YeeShiroi (CSSAS Rep)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Mike Kaweck, Facilitator (SRA International)

**B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES**

Mark Whitmore, County Co-Leader opened the meeting with a review of the proposed agenda.

### C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Estimated Timeframe	Agenda Item	Discussion Leader(s)
10:00 – 10:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Greetings</li> <li>- Housekeeping Items (Lunch, Restrooms, Phones, etc.)</li> <li>- Assign Roles               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scribe</li> <li>- Meeting Minutes Recorder</li> <li>- Action Items and Ancillary Issues Recorder</li> <li>- “Ambassador” to other Workgroups (Contact Point and Surveyor)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Review of Friday’s Meeting</li> <li>- Review of current Action Items List</li> </ul>	Mark Whitmore and Carmen Cody
10:30 – 12:00	<p>Step through all “Current Status” questions – discuss each and attempt to answer each</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What does the legislation require?</li> <li>2. What organizations participate in the child support process in California?</li> <li>3. What performance data is each of the child support organizations mandated to collect?</li> <li>4. Who has mandated the collection of data?</li> <li>5. Do any of those agencies have performance standards or targets?</li> <li>6. How is the performance data reported and distributed?</li> <li>7. Is the data currently being collected believed to be accurate and reliable?</li> </ol>	<p>Mark</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nancy Melton</li> <li>2. John Braun &amp; Michael Coleman</li> <li>3. Nancy &amp; John</li> <li>4. Nancy &amp; John</li> <li>5. Nancy &amp; John</li> <li>6. John</li> <li>7. John &amp; Michael</li> </ol>
12:00 – 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 – 1:00	Continue answering “Current Status” questions	(same as above)
1:00 – 2:30	<p>Step through “Short Term Goals” questions #1 and #2 – discuss each and attempt to answer each</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the purpose of having performance measures?</li> <li>2. Does the purpose vary for different participants in the child support program – local agencies, DCSS, FTB, the courts, the facilitators, etc.?</li> </ol>	Mica Bennett
2:30 – 3:15	<p>Begin a discussion over “Short Term Goals” question #3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Do the mandated measures enable the Department to comply with the purpose of having the measures?</li> </ol>	John & Michael
3:15 – 3:30	<p>Wrap-Up Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summarize Accomplishments / Assess Progress</li> <li>- Review newly identified Action Items</li> <li>- Assign tasks to group members</li> <li>- Modify / Set Agenda for future meetings</li> </ul>	Mark & Carmen

**D. Absent Information:** At the last meeting, it was noted that as performance measures should drive the organization to achieving its goals, the group needed information from

DCSS defining the overall goals and objectives of the organization. Mike Kawecky was tasked with consulting with DCSS leadership to determine what State objectives we should be pointing measures towards. He reported that although DCSS did have some information in draft form, it had not been finalized and was not ready for publication and/or discussion.

**E. Agenda Items 1-7: Discussion of Legislation, Existing Measures, Data Reliability** – the following discussion addresses background issues identified at the previous meeting.

- **Legislation:** Nancy Melton (Analyst) prepared an analysis of the performance measures outlined in Family Code § 17602. The 5 federal measures, as outlined in 17600, were also presented. Discussion was held on the inclusion of measures defined in SB 1410 as well as the added “incentive” measures of AB1111.
- **Decision:** To include SB1410 and AB111 as areas for comment only.
- **Organizations:** John Braun (Analyst) and Michael Coleman (DCSS) prepared a comprehensive listing of those organizations participating in the child support process. It was determined that the majority listed were outside the authority of DCSS – and that no recommendations regarding organization-specific performance measures would be of benefit. However, it was noted that there are two organizations, which directly impact the ability of both the State and the local IVD agencies to achieve their goals – DOJ and FTB. Additionally, some discussion was given to the impact the county Boards of Supervisors has on the ability of the local agencies to budget for necessary expenditures – which also affects local performance.
- **Decision:** To consider both FTB and DOJ for possible inclusion - determine whether measures should be developed specific to those organizations.
- **Required Reporting:** Michael and John provided a listing of State-required reports outlining the child support-related data currently available. A more critical “short list” was prepared which identified those reports considered most relevant to the workgroup project. It was felt that the CS157 probably contained most of the data necessary for the measures defined in the above-noted legislation.
- **Decision:** John (Analyst) will map the performance measures outlined above to the 157 to determine whether data is currently available to meet possible legislative and federal requirements.
- **Agency Targets:** DCSS reported that there appear to be no other agency performance standards, measures, and/or “targets”.
- **Data Distribution:** DCSS reported that information coming from the local agencies is compiled and sent to OCSE. DCSS also compiles the same information and reports it in the “CSTAR” report. It was noted that to date, the last State-compiled report received by the local agencies reported 1998 data. A more recent CSTAR report is currently in the “DRAFT” stage and has yet to be disseminated.

- **Decision:** Add DCSS to the list of agencies for which the need for performance measures should be evaluated. The communication of current information is required if performance measures are to be effective.
- **Data Accuracy:** Detailed discussion was held on the accuracy of reported data. There was consensus of the group that although the financial data reported might be reliable, the case-related data is not. Various reasons for data inaccuracy and/or incomparability (between counties) include but are not limited to:
  - Differing case constructs
  - Differing historical practices
  - Terminology open to interpretation
  - Ability of automated systems designed prior to CS157 generation to compile data based on new requirements.

As PRISM has certified the six automated systems as approved for consortia, it was requested that DCSS (Carmen) discuss the accuracy of system-generated reports with PRISM. It was further requested that DCSS bring staff to the next meeting to discuss the level of review these systems have been subjected to with respect to the accuracy of State-required reports.

Additionally, DCSS will look at the BSA Report recommendations as they pertain to the accuracy of reported data and respond at the next meeting on how those recommendations are being addressed.

- **Conclusion:** Without accurate, consistent data, performance measures are not effective.

## **F. Goals/Purpose of Performance Measures**

At the prior meeting, Mica Bennett had been assigned to lead the discussion on the “purpose of performance measures”. She presented a paper outlining information generated by Kaplan, the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, and the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. After lengthy discussion, consensus was reached that:

- **The Purpose of Performance Measures:** “Enhance the capability of statewide child support program to achieve success in its mission. They provide guidance to staff throughout the program by communicating focused goals in terms that everyone understands.”

Performance measures are also crucial for:

- setting goals and objectives
  - planning program activities to accomplish these goals and objectives
  - allocating resources to programs
  - monitoring and evaluating results to determine if progress is being made toward achieving the goals and objectives, and
  - modifying program plans to enhance performance.
- **Definition and Characteristics of Performance Measures:** Performance measures are quantitative statements that are indicators of our progress in achieving results significant to the mission of the child support program.

Performance measures should possess the following characteristics (as stated in Concepts Statement No. 2 by the Government Accounting Standards Board):

- relevance,
- understandability,
- comparability,
- timeliness,
- consistency, and
- reliability.

In addition to these characteristics, measures should be as limited in number as possible to provide focus, but must be sufficiently comprehensive to give a full picture of program performance.

Finally, performance measures should reflect program level goals; then sub-measures should be developed for local child support agencies and other entities as appropriate and as reflects mandated accountability.

**G. Issues for Consideration:** The following is a list of additional points to consider when evaluating performance measures for inclusion as requirements:

- Consideration given for the needs of our customers
- Looking for balance when defining the final measures
- Limiting the number of measures
- Avoid setting measures that pit entities against each other

## **H. Conclusions**

- We must accept the five federal measures as a requirement.
- The 9 State measures, as defined in Family Code §17602, will be evaluated against stated goals and objectives.

- Other measures, not previously identified may be recommended.

#### **D. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION**

- See Attached “Action Items” list.
- Ken Masuda has accepted the responsibility of providing coordination with the other P3 groups. He will work with Mike to develop a vehicle for reviewing workgroup minutes and isolating and communicating issues, which are relevant to the Performance workgroup.
- Mica and Mike will develop a template for workgroup members to use to evaluate the 9 State measures. Included will be the requirements that the goals and objectives for each measure be defined, the numerical values included, and any potential constraints identified. Members should attempt to complete the template prior to the next meeting (August 9, 2000).

#### **J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES – None noted**

#### **K. ATTACHMENTS**

- Action Items